DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 639 JC 880 252

AUTHOR	Martorana, S. V.; Garland, Peter H.
TITLE	State Legislation and State Level Public Policy Affecting Community, Junior, and Two-Year Technical College Education, 1985. A Report to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC).
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE	Dec 86
NOTE	47p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; College Administration; College Programs; *Community Colleges; Court Litigation; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Trends; National Surveys; Public Policy; School Personnel; *State Legislation; Trend Analysis; *Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Since 1975, the Center for the Study of Higher Education, the Pennsylvania State University, and the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges have cooperated in an annual study to identify and analyze pertinent state legislation affecting two-year colleges throughout the United States, to examine the issues which attract public policy action and attention, and to identify trends. An analyis of 1983 legislation, based on information provided by 40 state officials in the 50 states and 4 U.S. territories, revealed that: (1) 37 states reported legislative actions affecting the two-year institutions, with range of 1 to 113 pieces of legislation; (2) 76% of the proposed 1985 legislation reported out of committee was passed; (3) common areas of legislative concern were finance, administration, personnel, students, and academic programs; (4) concern for quality was evident in the growing frequency of legislation dealing with academic programs; (5) only one state reported that a court decision affecting two-year institutions had been made; and (6) 14 states had recently taken action to alter or investigate the focus of the community colleges' mission. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294639

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.V. Martorana

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

STATE LEGISLATION AND STATE LEVEL PUBLIC POLICY AFFECTING COMMUNITY, JUNIOR, AND TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL COLLEGE EDUCATION, 1985

A Report to the National Council of State Directors
of Community and Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC)

by

S. V. Martorana
and
Peter H. Garland

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
133 Willard Building
University Park, PA 16802

December 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 880 252

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Acknowledgements		ii
List of Tables		iii
I.	Highlights of 1986 Report	1
II.	Background, Procedures, Coverage of Jurisdictions	4
III.	Level of Legislative Actions by States, Type, and Topic	9
IV.	Court Cases	22
V.	State Public Policy Attention on Community College Mission	24
VI.	Overview, Major Observations and Discussion, Conclusion	34
References		41
Notes on the Authors		42

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When an activity rests on a repeated procedure involving the same individuals and organizations over a long time, it becomes easy to consider the whole thing routine and to overlook too quickly how many people are involved as well as the importance of their participation. We do not want that to apply to the annual survey analysis and report on state legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges; the present report is twelfth in the series. It is the work of many hands and minds.

Most notably among them are the state officials whose membership make up the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges and their staffs who help to provide the raw materials for the report each year. At the analysis interpreting and reporting end are the co-authors of each report. While in a sense they are assistants to me in a continuing program in which they may have only a passing part, in another, and very real sense, they are colleague professionals working to serve the field of community college education by attending to a task that is useful to that field. Peter H. Garland is the seventh of co-workers in the series and merits a special thanks because of his willingness to move fully from assistant to co-worker status and to take the work of initial analysis with him when he entered the field of practice on a full-time basis. And finally, there are those who provide secretarial help that is absolutely essential for a successful writing and publishing endeavor; Sally Kelley in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University provided that key assistance for which I am deeply grateful.

S. V. Martorana

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Jurisdictions Responding to Requests for 1985 Legislation and Related Material	8
2	Number of Pieces of Significant Legislation by State and Status of Legislation	10
3	1985 Reported State Legislation by State, Broad Topics Covered, and Status of Legislation	12
4	Number of Topics Covered in Total of Legislation by Status of Legislation	13
5	Legislation on Broad Topics as a Percentage of Total Legislation -- 1984 and 1985	18

CHAPTER I

HIGHLIGHTS OF 1985 REPORT

* * * Over two-thirds (40) of the 55 political jurisdictions of the nation contacted (50 states, District of Columbia, 4 U.S. territories) responded to requests for 1985 legislation information; 37 reported actions taken.

* * * Despite some evidence to the contrary in 1984, the level of legislative activity in 1985 suggests continued increases in the amount of legislation considered each year. The advice given to state offices responsible for community, junior, and two-year technical colleges, as well as leaders of community college education in other settings, particularly presidents and members of boards of trustees of individual colleges, in earlier annual reports in this series to the need for a close surveillance of activity every legislative year needs to be repeated.

* * * Most legislative proposals that reach the attention of the legislature, that is, reported out of committee, are enacted. Seventy-six percent of legislation proposed in 1985 was passed; only about twelve percent failed, with the balance in a pending status at the time work on this report was closed.

* * * The level of legislative activity varies widely among states reporting legislative action; the range among the 37 states reporting legislation during 1985 was from one piece to one hundred thirteen pieces; the average was 18.0 pieces of legislation.

* * * Patterns of topics on which state legislation focused vary somewhat from state to state, but common concentrations of concern are evident on the topical areas of finance, administration, personnel, students, and academic programs. Physical facilities and institutional growth continue to be topical areas relatively lowest in levels of activity reported.

* * * This year as in the last, legislation reflecting concern about quality in two-year college education directly is not frequent; however, that concern is evident indirectly in the growing frequency of legislation dealing with academic programs and its proportionate increase among the several topical areas making up the total of legislation considered.

* * * A decline in student-related legislation along with a change in the student-related issues is evident in items considered in 1985, with more legislation found, however, focusing on matters of tuition, loans and scholarships, and student mobility across state lines.

* * * Of 21 states responding to the request for information about relevant court cases decided during the previous year, only one reported that such action had occurred. That state reported a case dealing with a personnel issue.

* * * The observed high and rising level of legislative activity dealing with personnel matters and the fact that personnel issues continue to dominate the topics of court cases reported provide further evidence of a relationship that merits attention in the field as well as research activities.

* * * Attention to community college mission is strong but evidence of changes from the existing commonly held purposes are not. Fewer than a third of the 50 states were found to have recently taken action to alter community college mission focus; 21 states responded to the inquiry about mission changes, with 14 indicating recent action on the matter largely calling for studies to be made.

* * * Initiatives concerning changes in community college mission were reported to emerge most often through a major study of community colleges or of all higher education. Most recommendations that appear in such studies must be acted upon by the legislature, a state board, or be implemented through executive action. Because they gain notice and suggest policy directions to such important bodies they can be effective vehicles for the consideration of mission changes and, therefore, need close watch by community college interests when they are under way.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND, PROCEDURES, COVERAGE OF JURISDICTIONS

Background

Since 1975, the Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, and the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges have cooperated on an annual survey and review of state legislation affecting community college education, broadly defined as that sphere of the American post high school educational enterprise encompassed by institutions highly committed to serving a particular local area or region of a state and offering programs leading to an associate degree as the highest academic award granted. Results of the study are presented in an annual report to the Council, and this is the twelfth in the series.

The annual survey and report seek to accomplish two purposes to serve both state directors and leaders of community-based institutions at the local and regional level. One goal is to identify and analyze pertinent state legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges throughout the United States, to probe analytically into the nature of issues which attract public policy action and attention, and to point at trends in those observations as the annual studies go on. The second broad objective is to extend the inquiry to help develop better understanding of the framework of public policy within which community colleges and related institutions must operate. This is done in two ways: first, by reporting briefly on court cases reported each year by the state contacts as involving the institutions of interest to the annual report

and, second, by asking for field comment on current issues or development believed to have implications for the policy direction of institutions involved in community college education.

This report covers the major findings emanating from the analysis of the state data performed by the co-authors covering the 1985 legislative sessions, a review of court cases held in that year, and a more direct inquiry into changing missions of community college education. In reporting these matters, we will highlight several trends which can be noted by relating the 1985 findings to ones found in the preceding annual studies. Basic information for the report was requested of state officials in each of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and several territories of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

Procedures

Data collection and analysis procedures followed those outlined in previous reports in this series.[1] For the survey of 1985 legislative sessions, requests for information, besides calling for information about appropriations and court cases as well as for proposals to and enactments by the legislature, asked state directors to provide information on a special topic of interest to the field. Prompted by the increasing interest in and discussion of the missions of community college education

---

[1]Recent previous reports in this series include: Martorana, Garland, and Blake (1985); Martorana and Garland (1984a & 1985); and Martorana and Corbett (1983). Full citations of these and other reports are included in the references.

observed in recent years, we asked directors to supply information about recent public policy action
which would tend to reform or alter the officially described mission of community colleges or closely related institutions in their states.

Legislative actions reported were analyzed against the design for classifying the status of the legislation and the topics with which it dealt that has been used in prior year reports. In the design, the status of legislation is recorded in three classifications (enacted, not enacted, or pending) as of the close of the data gathering phase. Subject matter topics used this year repeated those established earlier and are reflected in the headings of the tables which follow in this report.

Coverage of Jurisdictions

Forty states and one United States territory responded to the request for legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges seriously considered in 1985 legislative sessions, as can be seen in Table 1. Serious consideration of legislation was defined as action sufficient to have the item reported out of its assigned committee to a legislative house. The 40 respondents represent 72.7 percent of the 55 political units (50 states, District of Columbia, and 4 United States territories) who were asked to cooperate in the annual survey and analysis of state legislative activity affecting community college education.

Also evident from the data in Table 1, twenty-one states (or 38.2 percent) responded to the request for information on court cases decided between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985, bearing significantly on community,

junior, and two-year technical colleges. Of the twenty-one states responding, only one reported a current case.

Readers of this report will likely be well aware of the high concern about the mission of community colleges reflected in recent publications and discussions at national gatherings of leaders in American higher education (Deegan & Tillery, 1986; Eaton, forthcoming). In view of that reflection in the field, the response of state officials to our query about actions in their states that had (or could have) an impact on community college mission was surprisingly low. Only 21, or 38.2 percent, of the jurisdictions responded to the request for evidence of public policy reshaping missions in community college education. We return to comment on this point later in the report.

TABLE 1

Jurisdictions Responding to Requests for 1985
Legislation and Related Materials

State	Legislation	Court Cases	Special Topic: Mission
Alabama	X	X	
Alaska	X	X	
Arkansas	X	X	X
Arizona	X		X
California	X		
Colorado	X		
Connecticut	X	X	X
Delaware	X	X	X
Florida	X		
Georgia	X		
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois	X	X	X
Indiana	X	X	X
Iowa	X		X
Kansas	X	X	
Kentucky	X	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X
Maine	X	X	X
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts	X	X	X
Michigan			
Minnesota	X		
Mississippi	X	X	
Missouri	X		
Montana			
Nebraska	X	X	X
Nevada	X		
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	X		
New Mexico			
New York	X		X
North Carolina	X	X	X
North Dakota	X	X	X
Ohio	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	X
Oregon	X		
Pennsylvania	X	X	X
Rhode Island	X	X	X
South Carolina	X		
South Dakota	X		
Tennessee	X	X	X
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington	X		X
West Virginia			
Wisconsin	X		
Wyoming	X		
District of Columbia			
Virgin Islands			
Puerto Rico			
Northern Marianas			
Guam	X		
TOTALS	40	21	21

CHAPTER III

LEVEL OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS BY STATES, TYPE, AND TOPIC

In all, as evident in Table 2, 666 pieces of legislation were reported by 37 states. Five hundred seven pieces of legislation were reported as enacted or 76.1 percent of the total pieces reported. In a like manner, 77 pieces or 11.6 percent of the total were reported as pending, and 82 pieces were reported as not enacted, representing 12.3 percent of the total. In each of these cases, only legislation seriously considered, that is, legislative proposals which were at least passed by the members of the committee to which they were originally assigned, were included for analysis.

From Table 2, it also can be seen that the number of pieces considered ranged from a single piece in Wyoming to 113 pieces in California. The mean of legislative items reported per jurisdiction of those reporting was 18.0. A generalization that comes from the data in Table 2 is that legislation pertinent to community colleges is generally successful. In the aggregate picture of activity over the nation portrayed in the data, an overwhelming majority (507 out of 666, 76.1 percent) of pieces of legislation seriously considered was enacted into law. In contrast, only 82 of 666 pieces (12.3 percent) were rejected. The several states, however, vary considerably in terms of success in legislative activity undertaken. Nineteen states and Guam reported passing all pieces proposed, but others were at a different extreme. Alaska reported none of eight pieces introduced as passed (All were still pending as of the close of the writing of

TABLE 2

Number of Pieces of Significant Legislation by State
and Status of Legislation

State	Enacted	Pending	Not Enacted	Total Pieces
Alabama	4	9	0	13
Alaska	0	8	0	8
Arkansas	12	0	3	15
Arizona	27	14	0	41
California	51	11	51	113
Colorado	2	0	0	2
Connecticut	33	0	0	33
Delaware	7	0	0	7
Florida	15	0	0	15
Georgia	44	0	0	44
Hawaii(3)				
Idaho (3)				
Illinois	11	13	0	24
Indiana	17	7	1	25
Iowa	16	0	0	16
Kansas	3	0	0	3
Kentucky(2)				
Louisiana	12	0	0	12
Maine	8	0	2	10
Maryland	7	4	5	16
Massachusetts	5	0	0	5
Michigan(3)				
Minnesota	30	0	0	30
Mississippi	5	0	0	5
Missouri	3	3	2	8
Montana(3)				
Nebraska	5	1	0	6
Nevada	3	0	0	3
New Hampshire(3)				
New Jersey	2	0	1	3
New Mexico(3)				
New York (2)				
North Carolina	39	7	0	46
North Dakota	7	0	0	7
Ohio	25	0	0	25
Oklahoma	28	0	0	28
Oregon	8	0	11	19
Pennsylvania	3	0	2	5
Rhode Island	36	0	0	36
South Carolina	1	0	0	1
South Dakota (2)				
Tennessee	5	0	0	5
Texas(3)				
Utah(3)				
Vermont(3)				
Virginia(3)				
Washington	17	0	4	21
West Virginia(3)				
Wisconsin	5	0	0	5
Wyoming	1	0	0	1
District of Columbia(3)				
Virgin Islands(3)				
Puerto Rico(3)				
Northern Marianas(3)				
Guam	10	0	0	10
TOTALS	507	77	82	666

(1) No legislative session (2) No legislation reported (3) No response

this report.), and approximately one-half of the legislation seriously considered in California and Oregon failed. Several provocative questions are suggested by this observation such as: Is the level of success in promoting legislation a function of the content the proposals or is it related to other factors -- type of administrative structure in a state, levels of local vs. state control, patterns of finance, etc.? Is it a function of external politics and the general political process? Are other social or cultural factors involved and, if so, how? More research into questions such as these are needed. That the level of success or failure may be related to the content of the proposals is suggested by the observation that California, which accounts for most of the topics covered in legislation not enacted (52 of 88 topics) shows a much higher proportion of coverage of academic programs in the not enacted category (16 out of 28 or nearly 60 percent) than in any other topical area. That it may be related to other characteristics of states is suggested not only by California when 46.0 percent of legislative issues reported were not enacted, but also by the percentage of not enacted items in Oregon (57.9 percent), Pennsylvania (57.1 percent), and Maryland (31.3 percent). Looking more closely at state characteristics and policymaking activity, Garland and Martorana (forthcoming) will soon report on the relationships between political culture and the policymaking process.

That both strong similarities and notable differences exist among the states in both the level of legislative activity and the topics of concern are generalizations that emerge from the data presented in Table 3.[2]

---

[2]Readers should note that a careful distinction is made throughout this report in the difference between pieces of legislation and topics with which legislation deals. At times, one or the other is appropriate to the discussion.

TABLE 3

Reported State Legislation by State, Broad Topic Covered, and Status of Legislation

State	Finance			Administration			Facilities			Institutional Growth			Personnel			Students			Program			TOTAL		
	E*	P*	N*	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N
Alabama	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	9	—
Alaska	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	—
Arizona	7	3	—	11	9	—	4	4	—	—	—	—	7	4	—	3	1	—	—	1	—	32	22	—
Arkansas	6	—	1	4	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	12	—	3
California	14	2	11	20	2	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	3	11	3	1	5	8	4	16	57	12	52
Colorado	1	—	—	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	10	—	—
Connecticut	11	—	—	11	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	5	—	—	5	—	—	36	—	—
Delaware	2	—	—	4	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	10	—	—
Florida	8	—	—	12	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	3	—	—	8	—	—	36	—	—
Georgia	5	—	—	24	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	10	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	44	—	—
Illinois	2	2	—	2	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	4	—	4	—	—	1	2	—	11	13	—
Indiana	9	2	—	2	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	2	—	2	3	—	2	1	—	17	9	1
Iowa	8	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	3	—	—	18	—	—
Kansas	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—
Louisiana	6	—	—	3	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	14	—	—
Maine	3	—	1	3	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	4
Maryland	3	1	2	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	1	—	—	1	—	—	7	4	5
Massachusetts	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—
Minnesota	13	—	—	17	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	5	—	—	4	—	—	44	—	—
Mississippi	3	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	6	—	—
Missouri	3	4	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	4	2
Nebraska	3	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	5	1	—
Nevada	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—
New Jersey	2	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	1
North Carolina	24	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	9	—	2	—	—	3	—	—	40	9	—
North Dakota	2	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	—	—
Ohio	5	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	5	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	25	—	—
Oklahoma	12	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	3	—	—	28	—	—
Oregon	3	—	3	2	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	1	2	—	—	8	—	11
Pennsylvania	2	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	—	4
Rhode Island	5	—	—	15	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	8	—	—	6	—	—	1	—	—	36	—	—
South Carolina	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	6	—	—
Tennessee	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	5	—	—
Washington	6	—	1	5	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	5	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	19	—	5
Wisconsin	4	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	9	—	—
Wyoming	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—
Guam	4	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	11	—	—
TOTAL	188	14	22	188	21	22	20	4	1	4	1	1	73	31	19	60	11	6	56	9	17	589	91	88

* E = Enacted; P = Pending; N = Not Enacted

For example, in California the high level of legislative activity is almost equally distributed among the topics of administration (31), programs (28), finance (27), and personnel (26). The state with the next highest level of activity -- Arizona with 54 issues noted -- shows most attention going first to administration (20), then personnel (11), and finance (10). The topic receiving the most attention in the third most active state -- North Carolina with 49 issues identified -- is that of finance (24) first and personnel (13) second.

Throughout the nation, strongest attention in community college legislation is focussed evenly on the topics of administration and finance. Each of these topics appeared 188 times among the total of 589 topics covered by enactments in the 1985 sessions. Concerns about personnel, students, and programs, however, continue to be notable albeit attracting legislative attention at from a little over a third to a quarter of the frequency noted for the first two concerns mentioned. These observations are made more detailed in the data in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Number of Topics Covered in Total of Legislation
by Status of Legislation

Topic	Legislation				
	Enacted # = 507	Pending # = 77	Not Enacted # = 82	Total # = 666	% of Total
Administration	188	21	22	231	30.1
Finance	188	14	22	224	29.2
Personnel	73	31	19	123	16.0
Academic Programs	56	9	17	82	10.7
Students	60	11	6	77	10.0
Physical Facilities	20	4	1	25	3.3
Growth	4	1	1	6	0.7
TOTAL	589	91	88	768	100.0

The domination of concerns of finance and administrative issues within the total of 666 pieces of legislation analyzed, continues a trend first noted by Martorana and Corbett (1983) and identified in succeeding reports in this series. Two hundred thirty-one notations of administrative matters as legislative issues, or 30.1 percent of all such notations in leglislation seriously considered, were made. Within the area of administration fall the sub-topics of governing boards, administrative operations and procedures, studies and surveys, and the like. Financial issues encompassing general and special appropriations, capital fund, and financial procedures accounted for 224 pieces of legislation, or 29.2 percent of legislation reported. Together, the broad categories of finance and administration encompassed 455 legislative topics and account for 59.3 percent of all legislative concerns reported. This represents little change over 1984 legislation (Martorana, Garland, & Blake, 1985).

After finance and administration, the next most numerous subject category was that of personnel. One hundred twenty-three pieces of legislation dealt with this topic, or 16.0 percent of legislation reported. Evident stimuli for this kind of legislation are concerns about Social Security and related retirement plans and the rights and responsibilities of employees.

Academic programs were the topic of 82 legislative issues, or 10.7 percent of all legislation reported. In this category there continues to be some evidence of factors generating legislative concern being less the wish to emphasize special programs (a factor noted in earlier reports in this series) and to generating legislation on such programs as "high technology", "women's centers," and the like, and more a concern for the

academic programs in general offered by community colleges and the colleges and universities.

Almost as numerous as program issues, student issues accounted for 10.0 percent of all legislation considered. A total of 77 legislative items were noted in this area with particular attention on student financial assistance.

Few pieces of legislation dealt with physical facilities or institutional growth. These categories accounted for just 3.3 and 0.7 percent of all legislative issues, respectively. The first of these findings, that concerning physical facilities, is relatively unchanged since last year where we noted increased attention. The second finding concerning institutional growth remains unsurprising in light of current general expectations of stabilizing or declining enrollments in higher education, coupled with developments in greater use of new telecommunications technology to bring academic instruction to students wherever they are located.

From year to year only small shifts in the relative importance of the topics from 1984 to 1985 are apparent. Academic programs, students, and administration each took a larger share of the total, while physical facilities, institutional growth, personnel, and finance represented a smaller share of the total. While these shifts were small, they can represent important trends in the making. One can ask, for example, if there is a shift of legislative concern from providing support (finance) to academic programs. We have already commented on the notable level of rejection of proposals having to do with academic programs in California. Other questions may be: Is there a relation to concern about quality and assessment? Are legislatures moving toward setting academic policy as well

as directions in patterns of support? Questions like these need continued examination and need a continued monitoring of the actions of the legislatures if answers are to be obtained.

A Resumed Increase in Amount of Legislation. In our report on 1983 legislation we said, "the most enduring trend since the current annual review of legislation affecting the two-year college was initiated has been the increase in legislation reported each year" (Martorana & Garland, 1984a, p. 6). But in the report on 1984 sessions we saw some indications that the amount of legislation reported affecting community college education may have stabilized. Taking only those states that reported legislation in both 1983 and 1984 (29 states) a comparison was made between total number of legislation pieces in each year. In 1983, these states reported 541 pieces of legislation, while in 1984 they reported 529 pieces, a decrease of 2.2 percent. At that time we questioned whether or not this was the beginning of a trend.

To continue to test that question, we compared states which reported legislation in the years 1983, 1984, and 1985. In all, 25 states reported legislative activity in each of those years. In 1983, these states reported 512 pieces of legislation, in 1984, 505 pieces, and in 1986, 574 pieces. The adjusted decline (that is, from 1983 to 1984 to 1985 for a common set of states) for 1984 over 1983 is slight, 1.4 percentage points, while the increase in 1985 over 1984 (13.7 percentage points) and over 1983 (12.1 percentage points) remains strong.

Upon this examination of the stabilization evident from 1983 to 1984, and the resumed increase inactivity, we are hesitant to refute the statement made concerning legislative activity through 1983. On the basis of

the last two annual reports we cannot say that without qualifications; however, because the trend is again upward, we believe that the spirit of the statement remains true: the general trend is for more state-level legislative activity affecting the two-year college. Community college policy decision makers cannot relax in keeping abreast of the lawmakers.

It may be that the slight drop in the amount of legislation in 1984 over 1983 is an understandable departure from the rule. There was a sizeable increase in legislative attention reported in 1983 over 1982. Indeed, we reported a flurry of activity in such areas as special programs and student issues coming as a result of increased focus on economic development and changes in federal student aid policies, for instance. While interest certainly remains in these areas and others, it is unlikely that attention to the same subjects would continue on at a phenomenal level of growth.

In our report on 1984 legislation, we suggested that one reason for the slight decline was that states may have reported more enacted legislation to the exclusion of other legislation seriously considered but not enacted. In 1984, 84.0 percent of legislation reported was enacted as opposed to 54.5 percent in 1983. While the portion of legislation reported that was enacted remained high for 1985 legislative sessions (76.7 percent), it does suggest that perhaps more legislative items not reaching enactment were reported and hence, a larger number of legislative pieces reported overall. Resolution of these possibilities is beyond the scope of data and resources for analysis available for this report. Interested persons should pursue the questions raised, however, both from the national perspective and that of particular states.

Beyond the overall amount of legislation reported each year, the context of that legislative activity tells a different story. The broad topics of legislation considered in 1985, as a portion of total legislation reported, changed little from 1984, as seen in Table 5. However, within those topics, a number of observations emerge. These include continuing attention to physical facilitites and special programs, changes in tax policy and in governing board operations, and more attention to student financial assistance and studies.

TABLE 5
Legislation on Broad Topics as a Percentage of Total Legislation by Topics, 1984 and 1985

Topic	1984 (n = 529)*	1985 (n = 762)*	Point Difference
Academic Programs	8.7	10.7	+ 2.0
Students	9.1	10.0	+ 0.9
Administration	29.9	30.1	+ 0.2
Physical Facilities	3.4	3.3	- 0.1
Institutional Growth	1.2	0.7	- 0.5
Personnel	16.8	16.0	- 0.8
Finance	30.9	29.2	- 1.7

* n's are of topics covered legislation reported by the states (n = 25) reporting legislative action in both 1984 and 1985, states not responding to survey or not having sessions in both years are not included.

Continuing Attention to Physical Facilities. Last year we reported an increase in interest in legislation affecting physical facilities construction and renovation and to various building regulations in several states. The level of activity in 1985 (3.3 percent of legislation) has maintained that of 1984 (3.4 percent) and is substantially higher than in 1983 (1.5 percent). This is due, in large part, to the deferred, major maintenance

needs of physical plants built in the sixties and now over twenty years old (Martorana, Garland, & Blake, 1985; Wattenbarger & Mercer, 1985). The extent of maintenance and renovation for new use needs of our institutions suggests that this area will be one of interest for some time.

Resuming Interest in Special Programs. Last year we reported some waning of interest in special programs. After substantial growth in this area in 1983 (Martorana, Garland, & Blake, 1985; Martorana & Garland, 1984a and 1984b). These programs focus mainly on job training and retraining efforts (Iowa and Pennsylvania, for example) but also on job and career placement (California). Despite economic recovery in most areas and now two years of attention to Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) implementation, considerable attention to this area (over 10 percent of all legislation) remains. Perhaps the success of a number of programs across the nation provide continuing motivation for more and improved state efforts.

Attention to Tax Policy. In the past several years, many states have enacted legislation promoting public-private partnerships for the expansion and support of educational activities. This year, considerable attention was given to matters of tax policy which affect these relationships. Tax credits for donations of equipment (Arkansas, California, Indiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, Rhode Island), for creation of new jobs (Iowa), and for work-based instruction (Rhode Island) were among the tax policy changes considered and enacted by states.

In a related area, several states have considered legislation to exempt institutions or those donating to their sales tax (Oklahoma and Rhode Island) while others are making changes in and adjustments to local and property taxes (California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Oregon).

Because of the importance which any changes in tax policy have for the financing of community college education, this trend will be monitored carefully.

Changes in Governing Boards and their Operations. A number of states in 1985 considered legislation which modifies the operation of governing and coordinating boards. Many of these had to do with the composition of boards (Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, Wisconsin), appointment or election to the board (California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Oklahoma), or miscellaneous administrative operations (Arizona, Illinois, Oklahoma, Washington).

More substantively, several states considered legislation which would create or change boards important to community college education. Indiana enacted legislation creating a council on vocational education while Wyoming created a community college commission. Legislation was considered in Alaska to establish a community college system. Legislation to abolish the current board and establish a new one was considered but not enacted in Colorado and Mississippi.

Briefly Noted. Several other issues emerging from this review of state legislation must also be noted. Studies of issues related to or having impact on community college education were called for in several states, including Arkansas, California, Maine, North Dakota, Oregon, and Rhode Island. Interest in studying such issues as financial aid, financing, articulation, and postsecondary vocational technical education remain strong.

Comparable worth for public employees received attention in four states -- Alabama, Arizona, California, and Washington. While only one of

these (Washington) was enacted, the new attention to this issue, though small in comparison to others, may have more careful scrutiny in the future.

CHAPTER IV

COURT CASES

Only one state (Maine) of the 19 that responded to the request for court cases decided between July 1, 1984 and June 30, 1985 reported a court case of importance to community college education. Last year, six states of 21 responding to the question reported a total of twelve cases. Whether or not the decline in the number of cases is the start of a trend cannot be determined now; not withstanding that fact, the topic of the case reported -- unemployment compensation -- continues a trend noted last year when a majority of cases reported were concerned with personnel issues (Martorana, Garland, & Blake, 1985).

The Maine case which involved an employee of the University of Maine was reported as germane to the survey's request because the University offers associate degree programs at a number of its branch locations in the state. The gist of the case is reported below.

Personnel. Unemployment compensation at the University of Maine. Bean v. Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission et al. A former employee of the University of Maine applied to State Unemployment Insurance Commission for unemployment benefits. The Commission denied his application and the former employee petitioned for review. The Superior Court affirmed the denial, and the employee sought review. The Supreme Judicial Court held that: (1) substantial evidence supported the decision of the State Unemployment Insurance Commission that the former employee left his regular employment voluntarily and without good cause attributable to that employment so that he was ineligible for unemployment benefits, and (2)

Commission implicitly determined that the former employee's belief that his former employer had conditioned its offer of continuing employment upon his abandonment of grievance procedures was unreasonable and therefore met the notice function of the statute which requires an agency to state its decision in writing and include findings of fact sufficient to apprise interested persons of the basis for its decision (485 A.2d630).

Discussion. The collection and presentation of court cases each year in this report is to provide an analysis of public policy action complementary to state legislative activity. The intent is to examine the extent to which issues in court cases parallel or otherwise appear to reflect relationships to and trends in the concerns emerging from state legislation data. Despite the fact that only a single case was reported, it continues to affirm the importance of personnel issues in various public policy actions.

CHAPTER V

STATE PUBLIC POLICY ATTENTION ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE MISSIONS

Each year, the annual survey of legislation includes an additional public policy-related question. This year the state respondents were asked to comment on evolving mission of community colleges. Specifically they were asked to provide evidence of any changes in the mission of public two-year colleges and further, to comment on the source of those changes in terms of their being proposed revision on statutory or direct or indirect actions promelgated in administrative regulations.

The reasons for soliciting this information emerge from the current discussion over the mission that the community college is to perform which is evident both in the scholarly literature on higher education and the more general debate on public policy related to it. Within the field, an example of the heightening interest in the subject is found in the conference on "The Social Role of the Community College," co-sponsored by the State University of New York at Binghamton and the Institute for Community College Research at Broome Community College in Binghamton, New York in October 1986, the proceedings for which are reported by the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse for Community Colleges at the University of California in Los Angeles. Examples of the concern in the larger public policy arena are many, including some of the items presented in this section of our report.

Conventional wisdom appears to be drifting to a conclusion that the commonly held mission of the community college is changing, that is, that its broad service as a means of universalizing opportunity for education

beyond the high school effectuated by a liberal admission policy and by offering a comprehensive array of programs and related student services is being significantly narrowed. We wanted to see if evidence of mission change would emerge as a conclusion when the matter was examined more closely through the observations of key state community college officials.

Officials from twenty-one states responded to the request for information concerning changing missions. This relatively low response rate is in itself notable; we interpret it to indicate that changes are not as evident as generally believed. Seven states or one-third of responding states suggested that there has been no recent substantive changes in the mission direction of two-year colleges. The remainder of responding states, fourteen or two-thirds of the total responding, suggested that changes in the mission status of community colleges are emerging which could modify the emphasis put by community colleges on certain aspects of their mission, but none reported that changes had occurred.

Changes noted by responding states ranged from the general (such as those emphasizing quality or economic devlopment) to the specific (those shaping particular mission changes or emphasis). Each of these changes identified by responding states are described later.

Changes in missions occur through the actions of legislatures, governors, or state-level boards. The focus of the statement may vary from legislation, executive order, or funding priority established by a governor, or administrative regulation or policy directive from state boards. Underlying any of these actions may be a study initiated by a governor, legislature, or state board either for all of higher education or focusing solely on community colleges.

In fact, when queried about mission changes, eight of the reporting states pointed out studies of all or part of the higher education enterprise. Some of these studies were recently concluded, some are currently underway, while still others just beginning. This clearly indicates the importance of studies in focusing public policy attention.

Summary of Mission Changes

Arkansas. A legislatively sponsored study, Quality Development in Higher Education to Meet the Future Needs of Arkansas was recently completed. Besides general and specific recommendations to improve quality in all sectors of higher education, two recommendations, specific to community colleges, bear noting. In one recommendation, the report recommended that where two-year institutions and vocational-technical schools operated in the same service region, they should be merged. Another called for an increased emphasis on the public service role of the two-year institution, particularly in regard to economic development.

Delaware. Delaware reports no formal changes in the mission of its community college but has noted growing attention to industrial training programs. At the request of the Council of Presidents of Delaware institutions, a task force was established to study public higher education in the state. Recommendations for changes for each of the institutions are anticipated.

Iowa. No major changes in the mission for community colleges are reported in Iowa, however, a growing emphasis on economic development from a variety of sources was reported to be shaping some of the program and services offered by two-year institutions.

Indiana. A working paper prepared by the staff of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education on future directions for higher education was issued in December of 1985. To help meet the primary goals of higher education in Indiana, three planning initiatives were identified: re-evaluating and improving access to higher education, refining institutional missions, and assessing and focusing of state funding. Several recommendations have implications for the missions and programs of two-year colleges. These include ones that recommend the adoption of a common statement of basic skills needed for college success; the demonstration by college applicants of the necessary knowledge of skills or complete a basic skills program before being accepted into college-level degree programs; the projection by institutions of the means by which associate degree programs in business, management, or supervision might be made more widely available in less populated regions of the state; the transfer of credit from associate degree programs; the expansion of the role of Vincennes University (a two-year institution in Indianapolis); the enabling of a two-year branch of Purdue University to offer the baccalaureate; and the further study of computer technology programs.

Maine. Recently a report was issued by a select committee appointed by the Governor to address general University of Maine issues. That report highlights the importance of the community college mission within the University and urges expansion of that component.

Nevada. The four community colleges in Nevada recently reaffirmed their future commitment to a five-fold mission to provide occupational/-technological programs, university transfer programs, community service programs, developmental education, and counseling and guidance services.

New York. No major changes in the mission of community colleges were reported for New York. However, recent legislation affecting governance which may have implications for the mission focus of institutions was recently enacted. The sponsorship of one college was passed from a school district (an atypical pattern in New York state where sponsorship is most often by counties) to a "community college region" composed of certain counties. While the enabling legislation is specific to one college, the precedent may have implications for other colleges and ultimately, in the mission focus of institutions.

North Carolina. Recently, the General Assembly directed the State Board of Community Colleges to have an outside independent study conducted to determine the following:

(1) Proper staffing patterns for institutions within the Community College System with special emphasis on the implication for base and enrollment formula allotments;

(2) An analysis of methods of calculating the number of students with an emphasis on the most appropriate census date for collecting enrollment data and the use of traditional academic quarters for determining curriculum enrollment;

(3) The impact the shift to more part-time students has had on the need for Administrative and Instructional Support Personnel;

(4) Whether the current system's governance, administration, and programs are effective in fulfilling the System's mission;

(5) Whether the System's mission and its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission is best served by permitting technical colleges to convert to community colleges; and

(6) Whether tuition for college transfer courses should be comparable to tuition charged by the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina.

The General Assembly has directed further that the study be reported prior to the convening of the 1986 Regular Session.

North Dakota. The North Dakota State Board of Higher Education is reviewing institutional programs, studying program centrality to mission issues and employing external consultants to advise the Board on the future of higher education in North Dakota. The Board is concerned about the formulation of policy necessary to maintain the strengths of the current system and to enhance its effectiveness for the citizens of North Dakota.

Ohio. In its 1982 Master Plan for Higher Education in Ohio, the Board of Regents identified three policy directions for the remainder of the 1980's:

(1) Significant improvement of the quality of Ohio's higher education system through the identification and enhancement of "centers of excellence" within each college and university;

(2) Development of Ohio's higher education strengths in relationship to the priorities of the state and of the broader society; and

(3) Building a network of support for higher education in Ohio.

The five-part Selective Excellence Program fashioned by the Board of Regents in collaboration with the leadership of Ohio's colleges and universities and supported by the Governor and the General Assembly, is targeted to achieve these goals.

One of the Selective Excellence initiatives, the Productivity Improvement Challenge Program, was designed to advance the level of excellence of Ohio's community colleges, technical colleges, and university branch campuses within the context of the mission and purpose of these institutions. This program challenges each two-year college to be more responsive to two important needs of the state: access -- increasing the participation and retention rate of Ohioans in postsecondary education, including

job training and retraining; and an effective business/industry interface -- becoming more flexible in response to the education and job training needs of local companies.

The Productivity Improvement Challenge Program funds creative and innovative approaches to achieving excellence in those areas. The Program allows the Board of Regents to find effective prototypic models that can be used throughout the state to improve the delivery of two-year college services. Responses received to this challenge evidence a maturing of the unique mission of these colleges and highlight the crucial role they play in economic and human resource development.

To support Ohio's developing human resource strategies over the years ahead, the Board challenges two-year campuses to:

- pledge themselves as full partners in local efforts of economic revitalization, and to connect community needs with the total resources of higher education across the state;
- pledge flexibility and responsiveness to adult learning related to employment, both pre-employment and on-the-job, and develop close integration of degree and non-degree instructional components to maximize student progress toward recognized credentials;
- develop for local businesses and industries contractual service capabilities ranging from single instructional offerings through the comprehensive design and administration of total training programs;
- pledge full cooperation with other local educational providers, and give full support to other components of local, state, and federal activities allied with job training and economic revitalization; and
- fashion a mutually supportive network of resources pledged to assure statewide delivery of comprehensive occupational education and contractual service.

This reaffirmation of purpose does not seek to reinterpret the educational charge long given in law to the two-year colleges, or to interfere

with the educational work of other providers. Rather it encourages the two-year colleges to become very good at what they were created to be, with an assurance of strong support from the Board of Regents to set out clear objectives for the future.

Oklahoma. Two recent actions in Oklahoma were reported as shaping changes in the mission focus of two-year institutions. One seeks to expand the programs of Connors State College in an area of underserved and under-represented black citizens. The other increases the outreach responsibility for participants in course offerings through telecommunications systems for a changing student body.

Pennsylvania. Legislation passed by the General Assembly in 1985 increases state support for programs in technology fields. With additional funds for programs in this area it is anticipated that, while not altering missions, this will serve to channel growth in the community college sector.

Rhode Island. A blue-ribbon commission to study higher education funding is currently underway. The commission will be looking at and offering recommendations on the mission of all sectors of higher education.

Washington. A series of panel discussions on the future role and mission of community colleges has been launched recently by the State Board for Community College Education. The re-examination of community colleges seeks to assess what the colleges are doing and what they should be doing to meet new demands. It is centered on questions raised by William Deegan and Dale Tillery in their recent volume, Renewing the American Community College.

Conclusions

These findings support a conclusion that while the mission of community colleges is undergoing re-examination in a number of states, there is no evidence that the generally accepted definition of mission that has gradually evolved and usually encompasses liberal admissions, comprehensive programming, strong student services, and a commitment to community development is under change. Indeed, the weight of response to our survey is that if any change is generally suggested it is toward stronger emphasis on local economic development and those related academic programs associated with its achievement. Intensifying state interests in economic development have implications for that element within the community college mission. The tension from the perspective of public policy, however, is apparently not strong.

It would be hard to conclude from the evidence we obtained that any of the actions or recommendations call for a fundamental redirection of the community college mission. More accurately, they represent a sharpening of the focus of traditional community college missions in certain areas. Of particular concern is quality, as represented in actions to promote basic skills in Indiana; access as represented in actions to promote articulation in Indiana or outreach in Oklahoma; and economic development as represented in the financial incentives now being offered for programs in high tech areas in Pennsylvania or in the changing emphasis in economic development in Iowa.

Studies appear to be the most prevalent vehicle for the consideration of mission changes. Studies, looking at mission, have been initiated by governors, legislatures, state boards, or, in one case, an ad hoc group of

institutional leaders. Their recommendations do not carry the force of law, however, they become, at a minimum, statements of policy direction which often capture the attention of lawmakers and lead ultimately to legislation. Regardless, they contribute, to the extent their recommendations become policy, to the public policy framework for community college education.

CHAPTER VI

OVERVIEW, MAJOR OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION

A short overview and summation of this report is best introduced by a statement of its intended service. It is compiled and presented to assist persons who are making policy decisions affecting community college education (broadly defined as that encompassing all forms of immediate post-high school education dedicated to a localized or defined regional service and developments through programs extending to the associate degree) to make those decisions on a more complete base of information about public policy within which they function. Production of this report builds on two advantages which we believe enhances its usefulness to the field.

One advantage is that observers of community-based postsecondary education who are not caught up in the day-to-day requirements of administrative leadership and institutional operations sometimes can see the condition of the enterprise more broadly. The other advantage is that a different perspective is also developed when a particular source of knowledge from which administrative leaders and other officials get insights by which to improve their professional practice is viewed over an extended period of time.

The availability of a review and interpretation of state legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges, made from a different perspective can be helpful to those who actively direct and operate these institutions. Moreover, it can help others who, while perhaps not directly engaged, have authority and responsibilities by which institutional operations can be affected. Among these are state officials,

whose collective membership in the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges helps sponsor the activity herein reported, state officials in other educational and non-educational agencies, persons in locations of national concern such as those in the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), the Federal Department of Education, and the like.

Overview

By continuing use of the same approach to gathering information, the design for analyzing the data gathered, and techniques for producing a final report, this twelfth report adds another year to a longitudinal base of information on state-level public policy affecting community college education. It adds another year's observation to the record of trends and their direction. As usual the response to our annual call for the basic information on legislative activity was high; forty of the fifty state offices responded. The more detailed results of the analyses made of the information provided was presented above. We call attention now to some more general observations and the sense of meaning that we believe can be attached to them.

Major Observations and Discussion

Our first observation is an alert to the field. We noted earlier that in the 1985 state legislation there is an indication that the shaping of academic policy is becoming more a state general governmental function than one reserved to the institutions and related state educational agencies. The implications of such a shift for leadership action among community

colleges are serious and merit careful examination by all interested parties.

In interpreting the insights that come from data reported earlier, we have a different reaction to findings that suggest high concern (and activity) among the lawmakers in different topical areas of community college operations. It is generally conceded, for example, that general state government must set the guiding policy which determines the level of financial support the public will provide for community college operations and capital needs. The fact, then, that these annual reports on state legislation show consistently high activity in matters relating to finance is taken neither with surprise nor serious question. Similar reactions and their justification can be attached to the related area of administration and administrative operations. Indeed, a steady acquaintance with findings reported in these annual reports develops the point that a large proportion of legislative actions categorized as focused on administration or administrative operations deal with the receipt, management, and reporting of funds.

A similar acceptance of an intensified role by general governmental policy makers, expressed in the form of statutory action on other areas, however, would be a radical departure both from the traditions of community colleges and those of higher education more broadly defined. Community colleges from their beginnings have demanded a high measure of local control particularly of academic programs and related services. The position is generally insisted upon as essential to quick and effective provision of programs needed in the community served, a consideration that makes community colleges different from other colleges and universities

which also generally assert strongly their prerogative over academic programs and related services.

How then should leaders responsible for community college education react to the facts that proposals for statutory action impinging on academic programs are becoming more frequent and are taking up a larger proportion of the total body of legislative attention? Explanations of the rise in public concern are possible. There is widespread malaise over the land about the "quality" of the entire American educational system. There are intensifying pressures for improved assessment of educational processes and for denonstrable outcomes. Community college leaders are joining the larger higher educational community in calling for tougher scrutiny of programs and operations (Zwerling, 1986); while federal and state governmental leaders are pronouncing more direct plans of action (Chronicle, 1986). The question becomes quickly: Who will decide? Against that question looms also the critical role of the faculty. One who is watching the field churning over these questions cannot fail to be impressed by the relatively low level of participation in it by persons close to faculties and academic administration of operating community colleges.

In the case of community colleges it is possible also to attach a more positive interpretation to our findings of increasing legislative attention to academic programs. It flows from observing that, although not continuing as strongly as in recent years, legislation is still heavily aimed at helping these institutions serve more effectively as means for community, regional, and state economic development. Generally speaking, legislative action in this direction touches on academic programs often along with finance and administrative procedures.

Concentration on this more promising base for public attention does not free leaders in community college education from the question posed above but reaffirms the importance of faculty in these decisions. Faculty are key to program development when it applies to community improvement and economic development just as when applied to student growth and development.

In comparison to the sense of importance to our observation concerning academic programming and the role of faculty in producing change, commentary on other observations are more mundane. From the standard perspective from which community colleges view their mission and the environment, one notes affirmatively the willingness of lawmakers to extend programs to special clienteles such as older citizens and displaced workers. Such actions help to legitimate community college concerns for the full range of persons whom they can serve. The question which must be constantly faced, however, is that of support. The availability of funds to serve a cosmopolitan student body, including adults with a wide range of needs, seems more than anything else to be the likely determining factor in continuing or reshaping the community college mission.

From the observations made in the second major section of this report, however, there appears to be little grounds for concern about the community college mission <u>when viewed in its totality</u>. As Vaughn observed in a recent speech, the emphases on particular components of the generally accepted community college mission -- liberal admissions; comprehensive academic offerings, including general education, liberal arts, and occupational programs; student support services; and commitment to community development -- may be slight (with the shifting itself varying from

locality to locality) but the overall social purpose has gained acceptance and so is not likely to change (Vaughn, 1986). The findings of our survey of state directors of community colleges gives further credence to the statement. The importance of subtle shifts, such as those reported here, should not be discounted but rather viewed within the larger context.

Conclusion

Having made this report of state legislative activity in 1985 sessions and beginning to turn promptly to examining the reports coming in on the 1986 sessions, we ponder the field that these reports seek to serve. The world of "community-based" postsecondary education in America is well defined in some respects while poorly defined in others. It is generally agreed that it is the domain of those postsecondary educational institutions that grant the associate degree as their highest academic award. But within that definition are included institutions operating from a wide range of structures and offering considerable variety in programs. In the call for legislative information basic to these reports, inquiries are sent to state agencies urging application of a very broad definition to the concepts of community college education. The agencies are asked to report any matter that touches all postsecondary education unless it pertains solely to upper-division baccalaureate degree or higher levels of collegiate operations.

Central to the purpose of producing these reports is the intent to help the field, despite its complexity and variety, to know what is going on in the realm of pertinent public policy, to become more aware of the trends that develop over time, and, thereby, to shape a better agenda for

bringing about improvements in the acceptance, support, quality of service, and general status of community college education in the society.

However, the impression gained from working on these annual reports is that the field is more directed by the policy agendas of other educational and non-educational interests than by its own. Readers of this report quite likely will be aware of the "public policy agenda" which is produced seriously and formally by the American Association of Community and Junior colleges on an annual basis. It is an excellent considered statement of goals, at least as seen from the national view, by which to help guide community colleges and related institutions to formulate actions that can improve their service and status. When viewed against the picture of emerging public policy on community college education as described by reports received from the several states to make this report, however, more disjuncture than congruity is observed. Questions to put before the field then become: Can there be an effective policy agenda for community colleges of national impact without a greater congruity among those evident at the state level? And the reply is that there is need for a greater common direction across state lines; we need to ask how that can be more effectively accomplished. The National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges along with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, as well as others, should seek the answers.

References

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1986).

Deegan, W., Tillery, D., & Associates. (1986). Renewing the American community college. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eaton, J. (Ed.). (forthcoming). Critical issues in community colleges. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Garland, P., & Martorana, S. V. (1987). The interplay of political culture and participant behavior in political action to enact significant state legislation affecting community college education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego, CA.

Martorana, S. V., & Broomall, J. (1982). State legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges, 1981. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Martorana, S. V., & Corbett, P. C. (1983). State legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges, 1982. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Martorana, S. V., & Garland, P. H. (1984a). Highlights and overview of actions in 1983 state legislative sessions affecting community and two-year technical colleges. A report to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Martorana, S. V., & Garland, P. H. (1984b). Public policy for economic development: The two-edged sword. Community and Junior College Journal.

Martorana, S. V., & Garland, P. H. (1985). Public policy actions deemed important by state directors of community and junior colleges. Community College Review, 12(4), 42-53.

Vaughn, G. (1986). The mission of the community college. Presentation given at conference on The Social Role of the Community College. Broome Community College, Binghamton, NY.

Zwerling, L. S. (1986). The community college and its critics: New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

NOTES ON THE AUTHORS

S. V. MARTORANA is Professor, College of Education, and Senior Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. He has directed this series of 12 annual studies and reports and has actively monitored state legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges since 1948.

PETER H. GARLAND is the Executive Assistant to the Commissioner for Higher Education and Acting Director, Higher Education Planning and Research, Pennsylvania Department of Higher Education. He is a Ph.D. candidate in the Higher Education Program at The Pennsylvania State University and former Research Assistant at the Center for the Study of Higher Education.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 22 1988